

McAlpine

Gotter, John

h

1686

1668

PAPISTS

PROTESTING

Against

Protestant = Popery.

I N

Answer to a Discourse Entituled,

A Papist not Mis-represented by Protestants.

BEING A

VINDICATION

Of the

Papist Mis-represented and Represented,
And the Reflections upon the Answer.

by Dr. Sherlock

L O N D O N,

Printed by *Hen. Hills*, Printer to the King's most Excellent
Majesty, for his Household and Chappel. 1686.

5

PAPISTS PROTESTING

AGAINST

Protestant-Popery.

MY *Replier* begins with Compliments ; and I cannot but admire his art of weaving raillery into them so neatly, that every Eye will not discern which is which. But of all his Compliments I take the *Reply* it self to be the greatest. Now in good manners I should take my turn with my compliments : but am forc'd to drop these, and stand upon my guard ; for the *Replier*, while he Compliments me with one hand, is giving me a box with the other ; in his very next lines calling in question my *honesty*, without any mincing it at all. In the Misrepresentation of a Papist, he says, *I have shew'd some Art, but very little Honesty*. The *Replier* said just before that he would *compliment no more*, and is as good as his word. As for me, I am much mistaken, if I find not upon occasion, more vouchers for my honesty, then Art : If I did by chance stumble into it, 'twas against my inclination, and I am sure I fell up-hill.

But he would have my Art lye in this ; that whereas I was told in the *Answer*, that some of those misrepresentations, which I had made of a Papist, and

A 2

given.

given out for the Protestant Character of Popery, were my own ignorant, or childish, or willful Mistakes, I craftily insinuate, that they grant all my Misrepresentations of a Papist, to be ignorant, childish, or willful Mistakes. Which is in short the Answer gives some, and I take all. And yet those two little words, upon which the whole Stress and Truth of his charge lie, are neither in the Answer nor Reflections; but are providentially juggled in here by himself, to give the Reader an early tast of his own Honesty, while he challenges mine. The Answerer had said, *must the Character now suppos'd to be common to Protestants, be taken from his ignorant, &c. Mistakes?* The Reflector says, *Because you say my Character is made up of false apprehensions, ignorant, &c. Mistakes.* What difference is here in sense at all? And what difference even in words; save that I add *false apprehensions*, which the Answerer likewise has in the very next page? Neither of us mention *all* or *some*, which the Replyer, not without reason, suspects of craft. As the Answerer thereof meant, I assure him, I meant; the whole Character, if he meant so; and part only, if he meant no more: Nor did I ever think of extending his Authority farther than he extended it himself. If the Replyer find any Art in this, I for my part, find no dishonesty; and think I have ill luck to fall into his bad opinion, for keeping precisely to my Adversaries sense, and almost precisely to his words.

The Replyer comes after this with full Cry, and asks, what is the meaning of all this potber and noise about this double Character of a Papist Misrepresented and Represented? Truly I cannot tell, and think he would do well to ask those who make it; for they

in

in all likely-hood know best. I for my part thought it a very inoffensive thing, to let people know what *Papists* are, and pray God there be not a fear they should appear what they are, least they be found to be unlike what they are made appear. They have been cry'd out upon, for keeping the people in Ignorance of their Doctrines; and when they expose them to open view, 'tis strange there should be a noise about it. Truly I did not expect it, and I could not imagine a bare Narrative of matter of Fact should fructifie into *Answers*, and *Reflections*, and *Replies*. I did but relate, playing the Historian, not the Controvertist: Not but that, with the liberty of Historians, who deliver their own judgment of the matters they relate, and their reasons for it, I discover'd what I thought, and sometimes said briefly why: But every Body will see, I made not Disputing my business. And yet, I know not how, it is taken it seems, for a piece of Controversie, and which is more unreasonable, against the *Church of England*, and defences made for her, as if my *Mis-represented Papist*, were a *Represented Church of England Protestant*: Whenas I never gave that Character out for a *Church of England Character of Popery*, thought nothing of her Rule or Judgment, nor dreamt of concerning her, or any Body in my *Mis-representation*, whose Conscience do's not of it self concern them. All those, who have such Idea's of us, as I there draw, I said *Mis-represent* us; and to those who have not, I said nothing. He that would know whether he be concern'd or no, has but to ask his own Heart, to which I did then, and do still leave him.

And yet notwithstanding this harmless justifying our selves, there is a *pothor* and *noise* it seems about
the

the *Papist Mis-represented and Represented*, and it is as fiercely assaulted on every side, as if it came to declare open war, and bid defiance to the world. The *Answerer* set upon it in the *Mis-representing* part, and will have that to be *false apprehensions* of the Author, to be *taken from his ignorant, Childish or Wilful mistakes*: And then the *Papist Represented* he endeavours to overthrow with whole vollies of Objections. Now comes the *Replier*, and tho he makes it wonderful hard (p. 40.) to know what the Faith of a *Papist* is; yet he acknowledges it in the same page to be true, as the *Representer* has declar'd it, excepting some few points; and therefore passing by the *Papist Represented* with some light touches only, his main attack is against the *Papist Mis-represented*; and not being willing this should be understood, as if made up of *Childish, Ignorant or Wilful Mistakes*, he will have it to be the very avow'd Doctrine and Practice of the *Church of Rome*. He will have the *Papist Mis-represented and Represented* to be all the same, excepting some very few cases.

And this he has urg'd so far, that I think, 'tis not now so much my Personal concern, to make an *Answer*, as the concern of as many as throughout the whole World profess themselves *Catholicks*, to consider the truth of what is here charg'd against them. The Salvation of their Souls, their Eternity is at stake. If what is here positively asserted against them be true, 'tis high time for them to reform, and to leave off the Doctrine and Practice of so much Heathenism, under a Christian Name. *Protestants* in hopes of a mutual condescendence, may flatter them as they please, and tell them, they have Charity enough to think they may be saved; for my part I declare, if

Popery

Popery be guilty of what he says, it cannot enter into my thoughts, there's any room for it in Heaven: and that there's any more possibility of a passage for its monstrous extravagancies through the *Narrow way*, then for those of *Barbary* and *Turky*. The *Popery*, this Author describes, seems to me a flat Contradiction to the Commandments and the Gospel; and the Professors of it can have no other portion then with Idolaters, Murderers and Adulterers, whose Eternity is to be in utter darkness.

He declares plainly that *Popery* is really that *Antichristian Religion*, which *Protestants* say it is; that it teaches and practices all those *Fopperies*, *Superstitions*, and *Non-sence*, which have been at any time charg'd against it by *Protestants*. His very Title of *A Papist not Mis-represented by Protestants*, is a condemnation of the Religion to all those horrid shapes and monstrous forms, it has been at any time expos'd in by Members of the Reformation. He tells his Reader in the name of all his Brethren, *We charge them* (the *Papists*) *with nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice*: And in this one Assertion vouches for the Truth of all that Infamy, and prophaness which is laid at their doors. And so gives assurance, that their complaint of being Mis-represented is but vain and idle; for that, what they call a *Mis-representation*, is in reality a *Representation in all the material Points, of the avow'd Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome*. That the *Papist Represented* (excepting some very few cases) professes to believe all that the *Papist Mis-represented* is charg'd with. This *the best and wisest Men*, he says (*viz.* of the Reformation) *have believ'd of them*. And in Fox's book of *Martyrs* we read how many were
burnt

p. 4.

p. 2. 3.

p. 2.

burnt for not believing, as the Papist Mis-represented believes. This is the General Character of a *Papist* according to the freshest and most Modern draught of our *Adversary*; So that now to receive a true information of the *Papist's Creed*, we are not to consult the Council of *Trent*, or the Catechism *ad Parochos*, but the writings and Sermons of *Protestants*: For however *Papists* may not know what they believe themselves; yet *Protestants* give a true and exact account of them, and are so far Infallible, that the *Papists* certainly are, what they say they are; believe what they say they believe, since *they charge them with nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice.* Upon the assurance of this *Affidavit*, me-thinks, 'twill not be amiss here to receive the satisfaction of knowing, what a *Papist* really is, and what he certainly believes, beyond the possibility of all exception. For since all that proceeds from a Popish hand of this nature, is suspected and challeng'd, and the *double Character of a Papist Mis-represented and Represented* (about which, as the *Repliers* says, there is so much *pothor and noise*) is questioned as to its Method, its Sincerity and exactness, we'l now follow our Authors call, and learn what *Popery* is, from the Pens of *Protestants*: and especially from some of those, who are supposed to know what *Popery* is; but for the *bad man*, which the *Replier* excepts against, we'l make no advantage of him, but let a better Man take his room.

What Papists are according to the Character given by the most Reverend Father *John* sometime Lord Archbishop of *York*, in his Book Written for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery, where he brings in a Papist thus declaring the Belief and Doctrine of his Church.

WE must Believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false.

If the Pope Believe there is no Life to come, we must Believe it as an Article of our Faith.

We teach that the Gospel is but a Fable of Christ.

That the Pope can dispence against the New Testament, that he may check when he pleases, the Epistles of St. Paul, and controul any thing avouched by all the Apostles.

That there is an eternal Gospel, to wit, that of the Holy Ghost, which puts down Christs.

That Christ is the Saviour of Men only, but of no Women: For Women are saved by St. Clare and Mother Jane.

That we put away Mortal sins, by becoming Franciscans, by a Bishops Pardon for Forty days, and a Cardinals for a Hundred, and the Popes for Ever.

That to become a Monk or a Nun, is as good as the Sacrament of Baptism.

That Whoredom is allowed all the Year long, and another sin for June, July, August, which you must not know: Allowed for this time by Sixtus Quartus to all the Family of the Cardinals of St. Lucie. B *That*

That the Pope can make that Righteous, which is Unrighteous.

That the Bishop of Rome is a God.

That the Pope may dispence with all Duties, and that our Principles set Men loose from all obligations in all relations whatsoever, between Magistrates and Subjects; Lords and Tenants, Husbands and Wives, Parents and Children, Masters and Servants, Buyers and Sellers.

That there is not any sin, but is or may be Indulged amongst us; and scarce a known sin, but there is a known price for it, and at our Market-rate you may commit them when you will.

What is the Belief and Doctrine of the Papists, as 'tis deliver'd by Tho. Beard D.D. in his Book Entituled, Antichrist the Pope of Rome.

They Believe that Saints departed ought to be Worshipped and invocated with trust and confidence as God himself.

That the Pope can Canonize them to this Worship at his pleasure.

That Images are to be adored with the same degree of honour as is due to their Patterns, contrary to an expresse precept of the Law.

That the Pardon of sins here in this Life, and deliverance out of Purgatory in the Life to come, may be bought for Money, and where no Money there no remission.

They make their unwritten Traditions, not one, but the principal part of Gods word

They

They place divers counterfeit Books, disguised under the Name of some of the Apostles, or their Disciples, full of Fables, Blasphemies, and Contrarieties, and yet commend them to the World as parcels of the written word of God, and Believe in them as Holy Scripture it self, as the Gospels of St. Nicodemus, of St. Thomas, &c.

The Pope hath set up a new God in the Church, namely a piece of Bread in the Mass—and to their Bread-en God they ascribe power to forgive sins, to defend from evil both Men and Beast, and to bring to Heaven—when as in the mean while most horrible Blasphemies against Christ himself are tolerated and slighted over.

The Pope is above Angels and Magistrates, he exalteth himself above all that is called God, yea, above God himself.

They prefer their Saints before Christ: They rely more upon the mediation and intercession of Saints, then upon the mediation of Christ.

They not only equal St. Francis and St. Dominick unto Christ, but in some things prefer them before him.

They affirm that whoever dies in St. Francis's habit cannot be Damn'd, and that it is as forcible for the remission of sins as the Sacrament of Baptism.

What the Papists are as Represented by Mr. Sutcliffe in his Survey of Popery.

T*Here is no point almost, wherein the Papist vary not from the antient Church, the Article concerning the holy Trinity only excepted.*

They teach novelties and false Doctrines concerning the very grounds of Faith; for they believe the Church to be built upon the Pope.

They speak what they can, in disgrace of the holy Scripture.

They give the Office of Christ's mediation to the Virgin Mary, to Angels and to Saints, they make also Saints our Redeemers &c.

For God they Worship Creatures, not only giving divine honour to the Sacrament, but also to Crucifixes and Images of the Trinity made of Wood &c. and they do adore not only Saints, but rotten bones and rags, they know not of whom.

They overthrow grace and ascribe the merit of our salvation, not to God's mercy through Christ, nor to the merit of his passion, but properly to our own works and merits.

They cut out the Second commandment, because it cannot stand with the Popish worship of Images.

They pray before Stocks and Stones, nay they put their trust in them.

They make no conscience to cut Christian mens throats for not yielding to all their abominations, and think it conscience to obey the Popes decrees, tho very unlawful.

The Fourth commandment concerneth the sanctifying the Sabbath, but the Papists profane it by Worshipping Idols, and frequenting the Idolatrous Mass.

Papists think they do God good service when they murder true Christians.

Amongst Papists, Adultery and Fornication are reckoned among lesser sins.

By the Doctrine of Papists the Devils of Hell may be saved—To this purpose they say, that not only wicked

ed and reprobate men, but also the Devils of Hell may have true and justifying Faith.

Papists blasphemously make Christ not only a desperate Man without hope, but also an infidel without Faith.

They deny Christ to be *αὐτὸς θεὸς*, and affirming that his divine Essence had a beginning from some other, they fall within the Compass of the error of the Tritheites; which Heresie doth tear the Unity of the Godhead in pieces, and plainly makes more Gods then one.

Papists do diminish the merit of Christ's satisfaction, and enervate, as much as in them lieth, the Cross of Christ; and the effect of his death and passion—They are teachers of Antichrist, opposite to Christ, and enemies of his Cross.

That Christ is not the redeemer of all Man-kind.

They make Christ inferiour to Saints and Angels, and prefer the Pope before Christ.

Papists make St. Francis and Dominick, equal to Christ in divers things, and in some things Superiour.

They give equal honour to a Cross of Wood and Metal, and to Christ, and looking on a Wooden crucifix they say, thou hast redeem'd us.

They suppose the Virgin Mary more merciful then Christ.

Papists account it a small sin to use common Women.

Papists believe drivers were by their Saints fetch'd out of Hell.

Papists by their irregular Doctrines and Traditions, have not only corrupted, but also disannul'd, for the most part, the law of God.

They deny the Gospel to be a rule of perfection, but they doubt not to give that honour to the rules of Ben-ner, &c. they speak more Blasphemously of the Holy Scriptures, then the Turks or Saracens.

To

To the Images of the Crofs and crucifix, they give as much honour as they do to God.

They fall down like Beasts before the Pope, and Worship him as God, ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ.

Popery as a sink, hath together with Heresie receiv'd into it self most gross and Heathenish Idolatry.

Papists say they put no trust in Images, but never did the Gentiles trust so much in the Images of Juno or Jupiter, as the Papists trust in the Images of our Lady of Loretto, James of Compostella, &c.

They give divine honour to Images, which they themselves cannot deny to be Idolatrous.

They ascribe mans justification to his Works, and exclude justification, both by Christ's justice, and by Faith, &c.

The Papists teach their disciples to distrust Gods grace—and to trust rather in their own Works and Merits.

Popery is nothing else, but a pack of old and new Hereses.

Papists despise marriage as Pollutions and fleshly life.

Bennet, Dominick, Francis and other authors of feigned religions took not their Rules from the Gospel, but thought they could frame a more perfect religion then the Gospel.

As the Gentiles had one principal God, and divers demy and inferior Gods, so have the Papists.

As the Gentiles believed that every one had his good and bad Genius, so the Papists assign to every Christian a good and bad Angel.

The second Council of Arles cap. 23. sheweth it to be a custom of Pagans, to worship Trees or Stones, or Fountaines,

Fountains, yet our English Papists cease not to go on pilgrimage to St. Winifrides well, nor to worship Stocks and Stones.

The Romish Church consists of a pack of Infidels.

They forbid honest Wedlock.

The Papist Preachers seldom teach the people, and when they do it, they preach their own inventions, and tell idle tales without edification.

Both Priests and People are most ignorant of Matters of Faith, where Popery is profes'd.

The Scriptures and Fathers they read not.

In a member of the Catholick Church, (they say) neither inward Faith nor other vertue is requir'd, but only that he profess outwardly the Romish Religion, and be subject to the Pope.

The Papists promise Heaven to their followers, so they profess and set forward the Popes cause, whether they be Murderers of Kings, or Massacrers, or Rebels, or filthy Whoremongers, or Sodomites.

They make more conscience to abstain from flesh on Friday, then to murder Christians.

Divers points of Popish doctrine are specially said to proceed from the Devil.

It is a common practice amongst Papists to give divine Worship to dead men.

The Popish Church hath no true Bishops.

The Pope is Antichrist.

The Popish Synagogue hath no true Priests.

Popery in many points is more absurd and abominable, then the doctrine of Mahomet.

Papists, that positively hold the heretical and false doctrines of the modern Church of Rome, can not possibly be saved.

What

What Papists are according to the Book of Homilies.

I *Mages in Churches and Idolatry go always both together—Images in Churches have been, be, and ever will be none other but abominable Idols.*

Oenomaus and Hesiod shew that in their time, there were Thirty thousand Gods; I think we had no fewer Saints to whom we gave the honour due to God, and they have not only spoiled the true living God of his due honour in Temples, Cities, &c. by such devices and inventions that the Gentile Idolaters have done before them, but the Sea and Waters have as well special Saints with them, as they had Gods with the Gentiles, &c.

Papists make of true Servants of God, false Gods, and attribute to them the power and honour which is Gods, and due to him only.

Image maintainers have the same opinion of Saints, which the Gentiles had of their false Gods.

Image maintainers Worship Stocks and Stones, they give also the honour due to God to their Images, even as did the gentile Idolaters to their Idols.

Who can doubt but that our Image maintainers agreeing in all Idolatrous opinions, agree also with them in committing most abominable Idolatry?

In many points our Image maintainers have exceeded the Gentile Idolaters in all wickedness, foolishness, and madness, and if this be not sufficient to prove them Image-Worshippers, that is to say, Idolaters, Lo you shall hear &c.

The Learned and Unlearned, Laity and Clergy, all Ages, Sexes and Degrees of Men, and Women, and Children of whole Christendome have been at once drown'd in abominable Idolatry, the space of Eight hundred years and more.

This

This is the *Protestant Character* of a *Papist*, and such as I always look'd upon no other, than of a *Papist Mis-represented*; and whoever will take the pains to compare it, with what I set down under that Title, will find there's little other difference between them, but that this is the *Fowler*. But now it seems it must be no longer a *Papist Mis-represented*, but *Represented*, and 'tis what the *Best and Wisest Men* have Believ'd of them. And here now what shall I say? Our *Replier* says, these are *Great and Good Authorities*, and we may well suppose they knew what *Popery* was. And for my part because I love not quarelling, I shall so far joyn with them; that if *this* be the *Popery* they have hitherto prosecuted with so much Fervour and Zeal; if *this* be the *Popery*, from whose infection they have so industriously Laboured to deliver the Christian World, they have done nothing but what is the *duty* of every true Believer. And if 'twas for the not Embracing *this Popery*, those Martyrs Recorded by *Fox* pass'd the Fiery Trial, their Cause was surely a Glorious Cause; and I question not the Triumphs and Crowns of Glory that waited for them in Heaven, were not inferior to what those enjoy'd, who suffer'd under *Decius* or *Dioclesian*. And for my part I am so far in earnest, had I a Thousand lives, I would rather choose by the assistance of Heaven, to loose them all at the *Stake*, than in the least assent to so much Heathenism, to so Foul and Monstrous a Religion. And what need now of any longer disagreement? What necessity of keeping up Names of Division? *Protestant* and *Papist* may now shake hands, and by one Subscription close into a Body, and joyn in a fair and amicable correspondence. *Popery* has been hitherto the only

P. 2.

C

cause

cause of Separation ; one part seeming to avow and support it, the other as Zealously endeavouring its overthrow. And all the strife it seems has been about a *Word*. For now we have been inform'd from *Great and Good Authorities*, what this *Popery* is ; what Papist in the World is there, that will not so far become *Protestant*, as to give his hand for the utter suppressing *this kind of Popery* ? And when *Protestants* and *Papists* concur for the rooting out of *Popery*, what possibility of Farther Divisions ?

But if on the other side, *this Character* of a *Papist* be intended, for the setting forth the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* ; if this be design'd as a *True Representation* of the Faith and Religion of *Roman Catholics* : Then returns afresh my complaint of their being *Mis-represented* ; that they suffer under the greatest injustice imaginable ; that they are expos'd in *Bears and Tigers Skins*, so to become a Bugbear to the Multitude : That they are malign'd and render'd odious for the maintaining such Doctrines, which they as heartily Detest, as those that urge the charge ; and that 'tis no wonder that *Papists* are put in the List with *Turks* and *Infidels*, since their Religion is thus injuriously loaded with Calumnies, and they made the Professors of such Tenets, which bid open defiance to Truth, Honesty, and Christianity, which strike at the Worlds Redeemer, and are impossible to be entertain'd by any Creature, that is one degree above a Beast.

I will not deny, but whosoever will look into the Church of *Rome*, as the *Scavenger* does into the City, who stops no where but at a Dunghil, may rake together so much as to defame her with the Inconsiderate and Unwary ; alas the Vices of Men in her Communion,

munion, their abuses of the most Sacred things, too abundantly furnish matter of this kind. But yet whosoever shall expose this for the Doctrine and Practice of their Church, and describe her, and all in her Communion by these Rubbish Collections, cannot possibly avoid the scandal of being unjust, and might with as good reason decipher *London* by those loathsome heaps where all her filth is emptied. And now since 'tis evident, the Adversaries of the Church of *Rome* do generally thus deal by her, scraping out of every corner of that vast Communion and in every Age, whatsoever can possibly contribute to make her infamous; there is too too much reason to complain of her being *Mis-represented*, and no just exception can be made against the Character of the *Papist Mis-represented*, which lays open to the World the Artifice of these unwarrantable proceedings.

But here now strikes in the *Replyer*, who undertakes to explain a Mystery in this Character; and the *Reflector*, he says, *will have no reason to glory, that he gave the occasion of it.* And this Mystery it seems, are some faults he has discover'd in the *Mis-representation*. p. 3.

1st. He says such things are put into this Character of a *Papist*, as *no Man in his wits ever charg'd them with*: And yet those very things almost in express terms, and others far more absur'd, we see charg'd (as is shew'd above) *by the Best and Wisest of Men, of great and good Authority* with the *Replyer*, as he confesses himself. (p. 2.) And this too is to me a Mystery as well as to him; that what no Man in his wits ever urg'd, and what the former *Answerer* calls *Childish*, and *Ignorant*, or *Willful mistakes* should be now seen Father'd upon Men of so high a Character.

2ly. and 3ly. He complains, that the Opinions of *Protestants*, and the consequences they draw from Popish Doctrines, are put into the Character of a *Papist Mis-represented*, as if they were his avow'd Doctrine and Belief. This is a pretty speculative quarrel, I confess, and might deservedly find room here, were it our business to consider the due method of *Mis-representation* in the *abstract*: But as our present concern stands, here's a quaint conceit lost, for coming in a wrong place. For what had the Author of the *Papist Mis-represented* to do with these Rules? He did not intend to *Mis-represent* any body. His Province was only to draw forth the Character of a *Papist*, as 'tis commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, or the Multitude, with the common prejudices and mistakes that generally attend such a notion. Now I would fain know, whether this Character, as it lies in the peoples heads, is distinguish'd into *Antecedents* and *Consequents*: Whether they, when they hear one declaiming against Popery, for committing *Idolatry*, as bad or worse than that of the grossest *Heathens*, *Worshipping Stocks and Stones for God*, distinguish between the Doctrine of the *Papists*, and these *Interpretations* and *Consequences* charg'd against it. Alas they swallow all down greedily and in the lump; *Antecedents* and *Consequents* go down with them all at once. Neither do I find much care us'd to prevent this misunderstanding in the People. For who is there in laying open the folly, as they will have it of the *Papists*, and positively charging them, that *They make Gods of Stocks and Stones*, that *They make Gods of dead Men*, and raise the *Virgin Mary to be co-partner with Christ in Heaven*, &c. Does afterwards tell his Auditory, that This is not what the *Papists*

Papists themselves *Believe* and *Teach*; but only what himself *Believes* and *Infers* from their Doctrine, as the *Consequence* or *Interpretation* of it, but they deny.

Truly were our Adversaries so sincere as to tell their hearers, that all their charge against *Papery* is nothing more, than what they *think* of our Faith and Doctrine; I would so far agree with the *Replier*, that this ought not be call'd Mis-representing, but only saying of us, what is not true. But they go beyond this, and instead of saying *we think so*, they positively say *so it is*: And possess as many as take Ideas from their words, not barely that they think we Teach and Practice Idolatry, *v.g.* but absolutely, that we do. Nay our Image-worship, is Worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods, says the *Replier* in his very next leaf without remembring his *thinking*.

And when the People read Books, intended as *preservatives* against the danger of *Papery*, they are still expos'd to the like deceit. For what ordinary Reader is there, that finds it positively asserted as above by the Arch-bishop of York. *Papists Believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false. And if the Pope Believes there is no Life to come, they must Believe it, as an Article of their Faith.* What ordinary Reader, I say, is there, that will not swallow this presently as the *Faith* and *Dollrine* of the *Papists*; when at latter end 'tis only what he *thinks*, and a *Consequence* far fetch'd to discredit *Papery* with the *Vulgar*? And when he's told by another hand, that the Common Answer of *Catholicks* to excuse themselves from Idolatry in their adoration of the *Eucharist*, is because they *Believe the Bread to be God*: Has not he here a fair occasion again of taking this for the *Belief* of a *Papist*; and that he *Worships*, what he *Believes*

Believes to be a *Broaden God*? Certainly he must be no small *Logician* that can discover, whether this be an *Antecedent* or *Consequent*, whether it be the *Faith* of the *Papist*, or only a *Consequence* of it. For my part, when I see *Popery* describ'd, as if none could be of that *Communion*, but he that can bring his mind to Believe the Word of God to be writ but for a few Tears only, and afterwards to be abrogated and annull'd. That whatsoever God says, shall be null and void, unless the Bishop of Rome, will and command the same. When I hear that the Pope is Antichrist, and Rome the Whore of Babylon, that the *Papists* have taken away from the People the Holy Communion, the Word of God, the true Worship of the Deity, the right use of the Sacraments and Prayers, and instead of them, have given to please them, Salt, water, Oyl, Spittle, Bulls, Jubilees, Indulgences, Crosses, Incense and an infinite number of meer Toys and Baubles, and that in these they have placed all Religion; when I hear, I say, *Popery* thus describ'd to the People by eminent Apologizers for the Church of England, I cannot conceive, but 'tis to let them know, what notion to frame of it. And yet whosoever shall suppose, that after such directions, they'l conceive a regular Idea of it, without a confusion of Faith with its Interpretations, of Doctrine with its charges, must conclude them to be better at Separating than the *Chymists*, and that in subtle distinctions they are able to outdo *Aristotle* himself. But 'tis too much to be fear'd, that those who expose *Popery* to the People after this way, are not willing they should apprehend it in its genuine Purity, and as free from this disingenuous mixture: 'Tis so like those who impose upon the Multitude with artificial Monsters, by putting the wrong end forward,

ward, and shewing the Tail for the Head; that if they are not deluded into a mistake, 'tis because they are not so credulous as they should be, and suspect something of a Trick in him that makes the shew.

And has not the *Reflector* now reason to repent after all, that he gave occasion to the *Replier* of explaining the Mysteries, he has discover'd in the Character of the *Papist Mis-represented*; since the faults he endeavours to lay open, are not in the Mis-representation, but in those, who by Mis-representing the Papist, rais'd a false Idea of Popery in the Peoples heads? The Character of the *Papist Mis-represented*, was intended only, as the Author expresses himself in his Introduction, for a *Copy* of Popery as Painted in the Imagination of the Vulgar: And being conform to that, 'tis exact and perfect: And if there be any faults in it, the blame must fall on those who drew the *Original*. But however we'll compound here again for this; if the *Replier* will but undertake to undeceive the People, and give them a more exact Notion of Popery, the *Reflector* will undertake to reform the Character accordingly. But till then the Character of the *Papist Mis-represented* stands good; and till the abus'd people are taught to distinguish between *Antecedents* and *Consequents*, between the *Faith* of *Papists* and the *Consequences* charg'd against it; the Character must remain as it is; and any Reformation in it would but make it irregular, and unlike that from whence it was taken. The *Replier* therefore might very well have spar'd the almost Forty pages he has spent on this Subject; in which, tho he has learnedly distinguish'd between matters of Dispute and of Representation: Yet this distinction being not to be found in the Notion the People have of Popery,

'tis

'tis nothing to our purpose. And the only end it can possibly serve for, is to let the World understand, how much the Papists are generally wrong'd in their reputation; whilst so many grosse absurdities, which are often positively expos'd for Articles of their Faith, are here acknowledg'd by the *Replier* himself, not to be their *Faith*, but only the Interpretations and *Consequential charges* of their Adversaries.

These are the *Mis-representing Arts and Faults* he mentions. For the *Representing Faults* he alledges.

1. *That I deny the Belief of their Interpretations.* And the reason is, it may be, because he thinks, no body charges us with *that Belief*: Which if it be but true, then I have not so much as contradicted any body, and there is no fault, I hope, in that.
 2. *I generally own the Doctrines and Practices, which they charge us with.* And how could this possibly be otherwise, if they charge us with none, but what we expressly profess to own?
 3. *That in some cases I disown that to be the Doctrine and Belief of our Church, which manifestly is so and has been prov'd on them.* Then for all his word to the contrary, we are in some cases charg'd with more than we expressly profess to Believe. As for his *manifestly*, and his *proving*, let that go for no more than what it is, his Opinion: 'Tis none of mine, and I think 'twill be no bodies else, when the matter comes to a Trial.

And here now we must turn over so many Leaves, till we meet with some other matter in the *Reply*. And the first that occurs, are some exceptions against the Rule observ'd by the *Representer* in declaring the Faith of a Papist, who to clear himself from the Scandal of Interpreting the Council of *Trent* by his own private sense and opinion, alledges the

Cate-

Catechism ad Parochos, which he had follow'd in delivering the sense of the *Council*. This the *Replier* could not pass by without an Answer, and therefore gives a satisfactory one. *And is he sure*, says he, *that all his Representations are conformable to the sense of this Catechism? May he not play tricks with the Catechism, and expound that by a private Spirit, as well as the Council?* Thus a Question or two is a full Confutation of the *Reflector*.

He alledg'd again the Bishop of Condom's *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, which being approv'd and attested by the *Pope* himself, by several Cardinals and Bishops, brought along with it the Authority of the *See Apostolick*. But this, it seems, works nothing upon the *Replier*: *Canus* has put a scruple in his head; and because he finds in this Author, that *That is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome privately, maliciously*, (a word slip't over by the *Replier*) *and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind*; he cannot therefore think, but that the Bishop of Condom's *Exposition* comes short of the Authority of the *Apostolick See*; and that the *Reflector* is out, in taking shelter under one, whose *Authority is nothing*, as he says downright, pag. 46.

This is Answering I confess with a witness, thus to endeavour to overthrow so considerable and Reverend an Authority, without any Authority at all, besides that of an ungrounded and ill-turn'd consequence; viz. Because that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the *Apostolick See*, which is given only by the *Pope*, *privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind*;

D

there-

therefore this Learned Prelate's *Exposition of the Catholick Faith* is to be thrown by, as of no Authority. So that our *Replier*, has here concluded without any more ado, that the approbation of this Book was only given *privately, maliciously, inconsiderately*, or else with the advice only of some few of the Popes own mind, otherwise the Consequence will not hold. But to shew how little the *Replier* has weighed this matter, and with how little pains he can undervalue any thing when he pleases: I need only remit the Reader to the perusal of the Book it self, which is lately published in English; the *Advertisements* affixt to it will satisfie him, that there has not a Book appear'd in this Age supported by greater Authority than This. He'll find it examin'd with all due deliberation, approv'd with all solemnity imaginable, by Men of known Integrity, Piety and Learning, by Abbots, Cardinals, Bishops, and by this present Pope himself, and recommended by his *Holiness* to be Read by all the Faithful. He'll find it not only thus approv'd, but even twice Printed at Rome it self, and in the Press of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, Translated out of the Original French, into divers Languages, as *Latin, Italian, English, Irish, Flemish, High-Dutch*, and this done by eminent Men of these Nations: So that besides the Attestations of those great Men there specified, it may be said to have the General Approbation of all these Catholick Prelates, who in proposing it to their Flock, sufficiently recommend it for a True Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church. And yet notwithstanding all this, with the *Replier*, it has not the Authority of the *Apostolick See*; nay its Authority is just nothing.

Now

Now methinks, I would willingly here know of the *Replier*, whether Those *Great and Good Authorities* above mention'd, who pretend to make a Survey of the Faith and Doctrines of *Catholicks*, have better Authority and Grounds for what they assert and charge, than this Reverend Prelate for the Exposition which he gives. And whether it be not a great Mystery, that every *Divine* of the Reformation shall be thought to have Authority sufficient, for defaming the Church of *Rome*, with whatsoever extravagant Opinions he can but find in one or two Writers of what condition soever: And yet a *Catholick Prelate*, Eminent in the Church for his great Vertue and Learning, in expounding the Faith of his Church, with the Consent, Approbation, and Authority of the Greatest Men of his Communion, and even of his Supream Pastor, shall be slighted, and thrown by as of *no Authority* at all. For my part I cannot understand this uneven kind of justice, and reasoning: Or why those who profess a Religion, and depend on it as to their Salvation, shall be thought less to understand it, than others who protest against it, and look no farther into't, than to render it Ridiculous. But it must be so in an Age, in which a *Papist* is not to pass for a Christian, and must not be believ'd; we'll therefore go on to the other points.

And for the clearing the most material of them, we need not look beyond the Exposition deliver'd by this *Prelate*.

1st. As to the *Invocation of Saints* he declares expressly, that They have no other capacity of assisting us, *but only by their Prayers*. And tho the *Replier* pretends, there's no such limitation found in this Author; yet methinks he should not have been so po-

positive, in a case, in which he's so easily disprov'd. The French Edition Printed at *Paris* 1681. has it expressly, *pag.* 32. The First English Edition Printed likewise in *Paris* 1672. *pag.* 29. And now this last Correct Edition, which came forth the last Week, *pag.* 9. So that, tho the *Answerer* has made some little objection; yet the *Representer* is sufficiently vindicated, in thus declaring the Faith of a Papist: since what he said, is founded not upon his own private sense, but upon an Authority beyond all exception, besides that of meer *Cavil*.

2ly. And 3ly. As to the *Popes personal Infallibility*, and the *Deposing Power*, the *Representer* declar'd, that, tho there were Men of his Communion maintaining these Points by way of *Opinion*, yet that they were no part of the *Catholick Faith*; and that *Papists* had no obligation from their *Church* of assenting to such Doctrines. And for thus delivering a matter of *Fact*, he has the Authority again of this Great *Prelate*, who having declar'd the *Primacy* of *St. Peter*, and acknowledg'd the same in his Successors in the See of *Rome*, immediately adds: *As for those things, which we know are disputed of in the Schools, tho the Ministers continually alledge them to render this Power odious, it is not necessary we speak of them here, seeing they are not Articles of the Catholick Faith. It is sufficient we acknowledge a Head establish'd by God to conduct his whole Flock in his Paths, which those, who love Concord amongst Brethren, and Ecclesiastical Unanimity, will most willingly acknowledge.*

And is not this a sufficient discharge of the *Representer* from all the exceptions of his Adversaries? For if this learned Author, having propos'd the *Primacy* of *St. Peters Chair* to be acknowledg'd as the
common

common Center of all Catholick Union, do's purposely wave all other Points relating to the Authority of that *Chair*, as being *no part of the Catholick Faith*: And his Book in this form is own'd and approv'd by the *Pope* himself, by the most eminent of the Cardinals, and other great Prelates of the Church after a most strict examination, what ground of quarrel with the *Representer* in his following this so Authentick a Rule? 'Twas the main design of the Bishop of *Condom* in that Treatise to separate the opinions of Divines and School Debates, from the Doctrine of the Catholick Faith. And since he omitted to expound those Points of the Popes *Personal Infallibility* and the *Depositing Power* as not belonging to the *Catholick Faith*, with so full and Authentick an approbation, as has been declared; where is the crime of the *Representer* in not allowing them a place in that List?

And here I cannot but run the venture of another simile from the *Replier*, upon the reinforcement of my former Proposal. I desir'd that the decision of the quarrel with the *Representer* might depend upon the experiment of any ones being judg'd capable of being receiv'd into the Catholick Church, upon his assenting to matters of *Faith*, in that form as deliver'd by the *Representer*. The *Replier*, having finish'd first, thought it not fit to put it to that issue; but chose rather to own that the Faith, as declar'd by the *Representer*, was really the Faith of a *Papist*, excepting the *Depositing Doctrine*, and some other few Points. Here then let him make the Proposed Trial, if he pleases, or any friend for him; and if, notwithstanding his refusal to admit the *Depositing Doctrine* and the *Popes Infallibility*, but as Stated by the
Repre-

presenter (that is, not as Articles of Catholick Faith) he be not judg'd sufficiently qualified as to those points, to be receiv'd into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, I will grant he has reason to charge the *Representer* not to have done his part in those Particulars. This will be a much shorter and surer Conviction then twenty *Answers* and *Replies*, fit only to cast a mist before the Readers eyes, and which such a tryal as this will quickly dissipate.

P. 40.

And this now is all that is requisite for a full Vindication of the *Representer*. For it being frankly own'd by the *Replier* himself, that he has made a *true Representation* of the Faith of a *Papist*; with the exception only of some few Points. And it being here made evident, that what the *Representer* deliver'd as to those very Points, is according to the sense of the *See Apostolick*, of the greatest Prelates, nay, I may say of the whole Church: *The Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, stands untouch'd. And all that has been said against it, have been nothing more, then so many artificial endeavours to perfwade the World, that the *Protestant* understands better, what the Faith of a *Papist* is, then the *Papist* do's himself; which will be easily answer'd after his manner, with a smile.

What the *Replier* adds after this, belongs not to the *Representer*, who being to *Represent*, and not to *Dispute*, is not concern'd with those tedious arguments; however, not to be uncivil, we'll go so far with him, tho it be out of our way.

P. 51.

1. He proves at large that all *Definitions of Faith*, declar'd in General Councils are not concluded with *Anathema's*; and in this we willingly agree with him: But this do's not at all prove, that whatsoever is declar'd

declar'd in such a Council without an *Anathema*, is an Article of Faith; and therefore nothing against us deserving any farther answer.

2. He endeavours to prove the *Deposing Power* not to be a matter of *Discipline* and *Government*, but to be a Point of *Doctrine*, and this from a Principle lately published in the vindication of Dr. *Sherlock's* Sermon, viz. that *To decree what shall be done, includes a virtual definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded*. And this he says, as we have been lately told. But what respect can I possibly have for what has been lately told us by another hand, since the *Replier* himself, however he urges it in one page, plainly undervalues it and contradicts it in his very next; where he tells us, that in the Council of the Apostles at *Jerusalem* there was a *Decree of Manners*, yet it contain'd no *Definition of Faith*. And for my part I think the *Replier* in the right, and must needs stand with him against the *Vindicator* of the Sermon; that *to decree what shall be done, do's not include a virtual Definition of Doctrine*. And the example produc'd by the *Replier* evidently shews it: For tho the Apostles in their Council (*Acts 15.*) decreed *abstinence from blood and strangl'd meats*: Yet this Decree of what was to be done, did not include a *virtual Definition of that Doctrine, on which the Decree was founded*: For if it had, then the *Doctrine of abstaining from blood and strangled meats*, had been an *Article of Faith*; which I am sure is not agreeable either to the Principles or Practices of either of our Churches. And the reason of this may be, because Decrees of what shall be done, are often made with relation to particular circumstances, of *time, persons, place, &c.* and not built upon Definitions
of

P. 53.

P. 55.

of *Faith*, but upon Prudential Motives, upon Probable Opinions, upon the Testimonies and Informations of Men; and so may be suspended or quite abrogated, as also confirm'd a new, or wholly chang'd, according to the alteration of Circumstances: Nothing of all which can stand with Articles of *Faith*, which being the indispensable Doctrine of *Jesus Christ*, are not subject to change or alteration.

p. 54.

3. But suppose this Decree to be rank'd only among the *Decreta Morum*, which concern only the Discipline and Government of the Church, yet our Adversary here urges out of *Canus* and *Bellarmino*, that General Councils cannot err even in such Decrees, when they relate to things necessary to Salvation, and concern the whole Church. And when the *Replier* has prov'd the *Deposing Decree* to be of this Nature, and esteem'd as such by our Church, he may then deserve a farther consideration.

What the *Replier* adds of this Subject (p. 57.) That the *Pope* permits the positive Assertors of the *no-Deposing Power* to pass without any Censure of Heresie, because he *wants Power to do it*, is spoke like an *Oracle* I confess; but because these are ceas'd now a days, we may very well suspend our assent, till we have some better Argument, than his bare assurance of what the *Pope would do* if he had Power.

p. 63.

The Last Argument, is concerning the *veneration of Images*. And tho the *Answerer* was willing, without any more ado, to condemn the Papists of *Constructive Idolatry* from some external Acts of Adoration us'd before Images: Yet our *Replier* readily grants, that those Actions are in themselves *indifferent and capable of being paid to God and Men*, and to be us'd as the expressions either of a *Civil* or a *Religious Honour*.

Honour. But he has given us an infallible Mark by which to distinguish between *Civil* and *Religious* Honour, notwithstanding the very *same External Actions* being us'd in both; and 'tis, that *Civil* relates to this World, and *Religious* to the *Invisible Inhabitants of the next*. This he says is a distinction allow'd by all the rest of Mankind; and though by all the rest he seems willing to exclude me, yet since he has given his word for it, I'll come in for one of that number, at least so far as to suppose it. So that here we have it now laid down as a Principle by common agreement, that *External Actions of Honour* paid to things relating to this World, is a *Civil Honour, Respect, Veneration or Worship*. And when they are paid to things relating to the invisible Inhabitants of the next, 'tis a *Religious Honour, Respect, Veneration, or Worship*. And hence 'tis concluded by him, that these *External Acts* of Honour express'd to any *Image*, that has Relation to some *Invisible Being* must of necessity be a *Religious Honour*. This is what the *Replier* proves, and we at present agree to. But if he thinks, as he says, that this *puts an end to the Dispute*, I think him mistaken, we being as yet only in the beginning. For tho it hence follows that *Papists* give a *Religious Honour* to Holy Images, yet till it be proved that all *Religious* Respect and Honour, is *so a Divine Honour*, as to make a *God* of the thing to which it is paid, at least *constructively*; he has not concluded *Papists* to be *Idolaters*, or guilty of *constructive Idolatry*; which is the thing he intended and undertook. And that he cannot possibly prove it from these Principles, without proving *too much*, and bringing himself in for a share, I think may easily be made appear.

For if Papists must be condemn'd of this constructive Idolatry, because they use *External Acts of Adoration* to an Image, which has a Relation to some invisible Being: must not all those come into the same List, who use the like *External Acts of Adoration* to other things, which have a like Relation to the same invisible Being? What excuse shall there be for him, who Bows to the *Altar*, or *Communion Table*, to the Name of *Jesus*, &c. All these things Relate to the invisible Inhabitants of the next World, and all *External Acts* express'd to them must by consequence be a *Religious Worship*: then, in the words of our *Replier*, *If to Worship any Invisible Being, be to give Divine Honours to it; then to be sure, to Worship the thing Relating to such an Invisible Being, must be Religious Worship also. For if the Worship be refer'd to that Invisible Being, which the thing relates to, it cannot be Civil but Religious Honour; and whosoever gives Religious Honour to a thing, do's immediately ascribe Divinity to the object of that Worship, and in our Repliers Phrase, by construction of Fact is an Idolater.*

p. 67.

And now how many here are included in this consequence? Certainly as many as admit of any Religious Respect besides to God: Which yet the *Replier* himself was not unwilling (p. 60.) to give to Reliques, allowing a *due Veneration and Religious Decency to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs*: And the Learned Dr. *Stillingsfleet* is well enough dispos'd to acknowledge a *Reverence and Religious Respect* due to Sacred Places and Things. So that I believe the *Replier* has overshot himself in this Argument: And that upon consideration, he will admit of some *Degrees in Religious*, as well as in *Civil Honour*: And that every thing

Def. p. 862.
603.

thing is not immediately set up for a *God*, which is Honoured with a Religious Respect, however this Honour may be ultimately terminated in God.

And this thought now brings into my mind, a close piece of Arguing us'd by the *Replier*, in urging this matter; and it lies thus: (*p. 66.*) *Civil Respects are confin'd to this World; But we have no intercourse with the other World, but what is Religious: Therefore as the different kinds and degrees of Civil Honour are distinguish'd by the sight of the Object, to which they are paid, tho' the External Acts are the same: So (says he) the most certain mark of distinction between Civil and Religious Worship is this, that the one relates to this World, the other to the invisible Inhabitants of the next.* Here we have a *Consequence* and a *Comparison*, and both so excellent in their kinds, that if any better connexion can be found in them, than betwixt the *Monument* and the *May-pole*, it must be by one, who has found one trick more in *Logick*, than ever *Aristotle* knew. If instead of his *So* in the end of his *Conclusion*, he had made this application, *So are the different kinds and degrees of Religious Honour distinguish'd by the Intention of the Givers, or by some visible representation, or determination of other circumstances.* This might have been infer'd with some dependance on the Premises: And by it we might have compounded for the matter in hand: but as the *Replier* has it, it neither proves, nor is any thing.

Another Argument we have just before this, which proves again *too much*, and is so unlucky as not to harm us, without cutting the Throat of his own Cause: The force of it may be thus express'd: *No intention can alter the nature of Actions, which are*

E 2 deter-

determin'd by a Divine or Humane Law ; Therefore since the External Acts of kneeling or bowing to or before an Image , are determinately forbidden by the Divine Law, the intention of doing no evil in them, cannot excuse them from Sin. For do's not this as severely strike at the Bowing down to the Altar, and Kneeling to the Sacrament as at us ? For those very Actions are part of the Divine Worship , and Bowing down is the very Idolatrous Action expressly forbid in the Commandment: And then, If there be any such thing, (as the Replier says here) as External and Visible Idolatry, it must consist in External and Visible Actions ; for we can never know what Mens intentions are, but by their Actions ; and then (says he) if Men do such Actions as are Idolatrous, how can the intention excuse them from Idolatry ? So that by this way of reasoning he can never throw us down, but we must fall both together. For tho the Sacrament , or the Altar are not express'd in the Commandment ; yet since the External Action of Adoration is a Religious and Divine Worship (according to the Repliers Principle before establish'd) the Bowing down and Kneeling to them cannot be excus'd from the guilt of Constructive Idolatry. And whatsoever hole the Replier can possibly find, to get out at with his Altar, the Presenter will easily follow him at the same with his Image.

But that the Replier may see, how far his Argument concludes , I would fain know whether a Quaker might not as reasonably make use of the same, for the justifying his Tea's and his Nay's, and his other points of Quakerism ? For if he should say ; *No intention can alter the Nature of Actions, which are determin'd by a Divine or Humane Law : But Swear not at all, Neither be*

Mat. 5. 24.

Mat. 23. 10.

be ye called Masters, and let your Communication be Tea, Tea, Nay, Nay, are Actions or things determined by the Divine Law: Therefore the *Intention of doing no Buil in them* cannot excuse the doing otherwise then is there determin'd, from the guilt of sin. This has equal force from a *Quaker* as from a *Replier*, and makes evident, that the same Arguments which persuade to a *Reformation* from *Popery*, do upon the same grounds plead still for a *farther Reformation*.

Mat. 5. 17.

Thus far have I follow'd the *Replier* beyond my business of *Representing*, and I hope I have so far oblig'd him in it, that however he has *Question'd* my *Honesty*, he will not at least, now call me *Uncivil*. Before I take my leave, I will be so free as to offer him a Request or two, which will not be thought unreasonable, I hope, since he himself has put them into my Mouth.

1. That he will use his interest with *Protestants*, to hold to what he says they do, and charge us with nothing, but what we expressly Profess to Believe and Practice.

2. That they pick not up the Abuses of some, the Vices and Cruelties of others, the odd Opinions of particular Authors, and hold these forth for the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of our Church. And that in charging any Practices, they charge them upon no more then are concern'd.

3. That as often as they tell what they think of our *Doctrines* and *Practices*, They would likewise at the same time inform their Hearers, that those Thoughts are, as the *Replier* says, *Opinions*, *Interpretations* and *Consequences*, of their own, concerning our *Doctrine*, and not our *avow'd Doctrine*: But that we think as ill of those Crimes which they charge,

charge, as they themselves do; and that We, our Doctrine and Practices, are as free from them, as They think of their own; and that in *this* consists the Difference betwixt us.

These are but very Reasonable Requests, I think, and what every Man may very well expect from his Christian Neighbour; they being not so much Favours as Duties: And what every one, who understands that Golden Rule, of *Doing as they would be done by*, will comply with without long entreaties. This is desir'd by those of the Reformation too, who require in their Synod of *Dort*; that *None judge of the Faith of their Churches, from Calumnies pick'd up here and there, or passages of Particular Authors, which are often falsely cited, or wrested to a sence contrary to their Intention: But from the Confessions of Faith of their Churches, and from the Declarataion of their Orthodox Doctrine unanimously made in that Synod.* And this is a caution of so great importance, that where 'tis not observ'd, 'tis no wonder to see Men contending for the Truth of Christianity, and to lose it amidst their Uncharitable Dissentions.

Concl. Syn.

'Twas my intention not to increase, but to diminish these heats, and for this end I put forth the double Character of a *Papist Mis-represented and Represented.* 'Twas this was the design of the Bishop of *Condom* in his *Exposition of the Faith of the Catholick Church*, and of the Clergy of *France*, in the *Acts of the General Assembly* lately publish'd. The method is inoffensive, and free from provoking Reflections; and if by this I have let the World know what our *Church Believes and Teaches*, 'tis what I intended: And as for Disputing I leave that to such, who think it worth their while.

F I N I S.

